



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,592	09/08/2003	Jamey Graham	015358-005710US	1929

7590 09/21/2006
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor and Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,592	GRAHAM, JAMEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed 10 July 2006, to the Original Application, filed 8 September 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller (USPN 6,613,100 B2 – filed 11/1997) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment, however, a new grounds of rejection has been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 25-46 are pending. Claims 25, 32, 39, and 46 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 25-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Koppolu (U.S. Publication 2001/0020243 A1).

Regarding independent claims 25, 32, 39, and 46, Miller discloses:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display (See Figures 2-5 and Abstract teaches viewing a plurality of documents represented by thumbnail images and a display area displaying current document), the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device (See Figure 3, item 340 user-input device), corresponding to a movement of pointer in first display area (See col. 6, lines 56-col. 7, lines 29 and col. 4, lines 35-45, wherein Miller teaches a mouse or pointer movement to select document) displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by a link to the current document, without selecting the other document as the current document and displaying the other document in the first display area of the display (on col. 8, lines 9-28 and see Figure 5 teaches other display areas 220-250 for displaying thumbnail images of web pages which are linked and related to the currently accessed web page that appears on the display panel 260 (see Figure 2B));

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishable from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document (on col. 4, lines 39-44 and col. 6, lines 50-66 teaches user selects appropriate thumbnail via user-input device);

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display (on col. 8, lines 9-28 teaches when thumbnail is selected by the user, causes the web browser to displayed the selected web page on the web browser's display section 130); and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to user (on col. 8, lines 21-47 teaches the user selects thumbnail image of a web page; the web page is displayed and all of the URLs contained within the web page are displayed as thumbnails images of web pages that are associates with the URLs).

Miller does not disclose expressly displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document in response to the movement of a pointer over a link within the current document displayed. Koppolu discloses displaying tooltips, i.e. a small descriptive text box, when a mouse cursor passes over a hyperlink (See Koppolu, Page 30, paragraph 0286). It was well known in the art at the time of the invention that tooltips provide information related to the object to which they are associated, such as a hyperlink as disclosed by Koppolu. Miller and Koppolu are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing hypermedia data. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the display of a tooltip associated with a hyperlink of Koppolu with the document viewing system and method of Miller. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to

Art Unit: 2176

whether he would like to access said document based upon the information provided in the tooltip. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Koppolu with Miller for the benefit of providing additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to access said document based upon the information provided in the tooltip to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25, 32, 39, and 46.

Regarding dependent claims 26, 33, and 40, Miller discloses:

wherein said representation of content is a thumb nail image of the document (on col. 8, lines 9-28 teaches thumbnail image of a web page).

Regarding dependent claims 27, 34, and 41, Miller discloses:

wherein said thumb nail image further includes highlighting of concepts of interest to the user contained within the document (on col. 6, lines 50-66 and col. 7, lines 25-39 teaches thumbnails are displayed corresponding to the chosen category based on user preferences).

Regarding dependent claims 28, 35, and 42, Miller discloses:

wherein said plurality of documents in a non-directed arrangement comprises pages of the World Wide Web (col. 8, lines 9-20 and see Figure 5 teaches viewing plurality of document via Internet Explorer).

Regarding dependent claims 29, 36, and 43, Miller discloses:

wherein said plurality of documents includes Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) documents (on col. 1, lines 29-43 and col. 4, lines 5-18 teaches web pages viewed using web browser).

Regarding dependent claims 30, 37, and 44, Miller discloses:

wherein said plurality of documents includes documents produced by a word processing program (on col. 4, lines 5-18 and col. 6, lines 17-27 teaches word processor application).

Regarding dependent claims 31, 38, and 45, Miller discloses:

wherein said plurality of links comprises at least one Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (on col. 8, lines 9-28 teaches URLs).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Finseth (U.S. Patent 6,271,840 B1) discloses a graphical search engine visual index.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 2176

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William D. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER